

REMARKS

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 17, 23-26 have been examined and remain in this application. The above claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Berger et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,693). This rejection is respectfully traversed as Berger does not teach or suggest the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1. For example, Berger does not teach or suggest at least classifying the correction data based on attributes of the user recited in the electronic mail and then registering the correction data in the data base based on the clarification results. Nor does the reference suggest the claimed combination as a whole. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. As claims 2, 4, 10 and 24 depend from claim 1 they are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. They are also allowable because of additional limitations set forth therein.

Applicant's independent claim 11 is a method claim and is distinguished over Berger for reasons analogous to those recited for claim 1. Further, claim 25 depends from claim 11 and is therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 11. It is also allowable because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

Applicant's independent claim 17 is an apparatus claim and is distinguished over Berger for reasons analogous to those recited for claim 1. Additionally, claim 26 depends from claim 17 and is therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 17. It is also allowable because of the additional limitations set forth therein.

The Examiner further alleges that independent claim 9 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Berger. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Berger does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 9. For example, Berger does not teach or suggest at least a menu that would allow the user to enter design information without downloading public design data. The instant application claims an information entry selecting means allowing a user to either, enter design information without downloading public design data, or request transfer of said public design data to the user with an editing program file. Berger simply allows the user to select a method of downloading public design data, either by picking a style from a menu list, or by entering a previously determined identifying number. There is no disclosure in Berger of an alternative to downloading the public design data. Therefore, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Applicant's claim 23 is a related independent server apparatus claim and is distinguished over Berger for analogous reasons.

By this Amendment, Applicant editorially amends claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 17, 23, 24, 25 and 26. The amendments to the above were made for reasons of precision of language and consistency, and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims and thus do not implicate an estoppel in the application of the doctrine of equivalents. The amendments to claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 17, 23, 24, 25 were not made for reasons of patentability.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 09/781,253

Attorney Docket No.: Q63086

best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Howard L. Bernstein
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 8, 2006